

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

<u>PEBBLE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP</u>	v.	<u>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</u>
JUDGE H. RUSSEL HOLLAND		CASE NO. <u>3:14-cv-0171-HRH</u>

PROCEEDINGS: ORDER FROM CHAMBERS

The parties as well as non-parties are in the process of briefing a joint motion to quash subpoenas,¹ a motion to compel,² and a second motion to quash.³ The court understands that these motions may be interrelated, and it is the court's intention to take up these motions when all three have been fully briefed.

Those participating in the foregoing motions may believe that the combining of oppositions and replies and/or combining a response with a new motion is helpful. Doing so may seem convenient. However, the entanglement of motions is not helpful to the court.

In the future, the court will strike motion papers that combine responses and replies, responses to two different motions, responses and new motions, or any variation of the foregoing. There shall be a separate motion, a response, and (if necessary) a reply to each separate motion.

¹Docket No. 159.

²Docket No. 162.

³Docket No. 169.

In connection with one of the foregoing motions, a party has filed three declarations that do not contain the case caption or number. That is unacceptable. Unless submitted with a filing as a listed exhibit or attachment, every filing – on its face page – is to contain a case caption with the case number, the title of the document, and the filer’s information. Additionally, each document should include the signature block of the filer and a certificate of service.

All counsel (and their staff) should be familiar with CM/ECF protocols, and should certainly contact the court’s help desk when uncertain about submitting documents in an appropriate manner. Both the attorney user's manual for CM/ECF filing and local rules include guidance on formatting and submission of documents.
